# Department of Biology

# Faculty Engagement & Contribution Plan/Report System

Approved by Provost: July 19, 2022

*Documents included in this PDF:*

- 1 - FEC Plan Purpose.pdf
- 2 - FEC Plan Guidelines.pdf
- 3 - FEC Report Purpose.pdf
- 4 - FEC Report Guidelines.pdf
- 5 - Summative Teaching Effectiveness Rubric.pdf
- 6 - Department of Biology Peer Observation of Teaching Instrument.pdf
- a - TT Teaching Effectiveness.pdf
- b - TT Scholarly Activity.pdf
- c - TT Service.pdf
- d - NTT Teaching effectiveness.pdf
- e - NTT Scholarly Activity.pdf
- f - NTT Service.pdf

FEC Plan Purpose Statement

The purpose of the Biology Department FEC Plan is to serve as a guiding document for planning the yearly contributions of each faculty member. Recognizing that individuals have varying strengths and talents, the FEC Plan should demonstrate a link between the faculty member's engagement and development, and the departmental/university P&T criteria. The document must serve several roles as there are multiple audiences, including:

- The Faculty Member - The FEC Plan serves as a roadmap to help faculty intentionally plan out their engagement and development for the year. It allows faculty to prioritize their contributions and thoughtfully determine whether additional responsibilities that may arise throughout the year will be pursued. Developed with feedback from the P&T Mentorship Team and Department Chair, the FEC Plan provides documentation of appropriate goals as agreed upon by the individual, their mentorship team, and the chair, as well as a measure of accountability towards those goals.
- The P&T Mentorship Team - The FEC Plan provides an opportunity for the P&T mentorship team to work with the faculty member in a structured summative assessment of the plan. By providing the information needed for assessment the faculty member expects careful consideration on certain aspects of the plan, such as the faculty member's workload, trajectory with respect to individual development, and whether the faculty member is on target with their trajectory. The P&T mentorship team should work with the faculty member to mold the  plan so it both reflects the faculty member's strengths and meets departmental requirements/expectations. .
- The Department Chair - They will provide feedback to individual faculty when developing their plan. They will ensure parity across the department, documentation and accountability of appropriate goals as agreed upon by the individual, their mentorship team, and the chair, and thoughtful development of activities and engagement for the academic year. The chair will provide an evaluation of this structured summative assessment to ensure that the trajectory of the faculty member's FEC Plan is consistent with the approved P&T criteria at the department level, and adheres to university policy.
- The Department - The FEC Plans will be shared with the department: to allow for increased transparency of all faculty member's contributions; to facilitate opportunities for collaboration within the department and community; and to foster enhanced student advising by providing a map of specialities in teaching, service, or scholarship to identify potential mentees for students.
- Evaluative Entities Beyond the Department - The FEC Plan will serve as documentation that the faculty member intends to adhere to all departmental and university policies (Policies 6.1 and 6.28).

The FEC Plan should be developed in consultation with the P&T mentorship team, and must include each of the components listed below, while addressing the evaluative criteria of teaching, scholarship, and service (Policy 6.1). Alternatively, an integrative approach could be utilized to address the three evaluative criteria. Policy states this narrative should be no longer than three pages and we have determined as a department that individual faculty can decide how much space to devote to each of the three evaluative criteria.

Reflective Prompts:
- What do you intend to work on this year?
- Why have you chosen to focus on these particular areas/projects?
  - Address their contribution to promotion and/or tenure
  - Provide rationale for emphasis area(s) and how this relates to your overall progress (i.e. teaching/service/research loads)
  - Address the continuity of your plan from year to year
  - Be sure to include reflection regarding feedback from your report, most notably areas in need of improvement.
- What are your long-term goals for engagement and development, and how will your work this year contribute to these goals?

FEC Report Purpose

The purpose of the Biology Department FEC Report is to serve as documentation of, and reflection on, a faculty member's yearly contributions and development. Recognizing that individuals have varying strengths and talents, the FEC Report should demonstrate a link between the faculty member's engagement and development, and the departmental/university P&T criteria. The document must serve several roles as there are multiple audiences, including:
- The Faculty Member - The FEC Report serves as documentation of, and reflection on, the faculty's engagement and development over the previous academic year. It allows faculty to reflect and report on their successes and accomplishments, and identify areas for additional growth and development, which helps inform the next FEC Plan. The FEC Report provides a description of the progress made towards the goals stated in the previous year's FEC Plan, including the rationale for deviations from that plan. Developed with feedback from the P&T Mentorship Team and Department Chair, it also provides documentation of the faculty's progress towards promotion and tenure.
- The P&T Mentorship Team - The FEC Report provides an opportunity for accountability between the faculty member and their P&T mentorship team. The mentorship team should review their consideration of certain aspects of the faculty member's FEC plan, such as workload, trajectory with respect to individual development, and whether the faculty member is on target with their trajectory, and also comment on how the faculty member developed. The mentorship team can then work with the faculty member regarding recommendations for improvement/development over the next year.
- The Department Chair - They will provide evaluative feedback to individual faculty members regarding their engagement, activity, and development as submitted in their annual FEC Report. The Chair will evaluate the FEC Report for accuracy regarding the faculty member's description of the progress made towards the goals stated in the previous year's FEC Plan, including the rationale for deviations from that plan. Developed with feedback from the faculty member and their P&T Mentorship Team, the Department Chair's evaluation of the FEC Report will also provide documentation of the individual's progress towards promotion and tenure based on the approved P&T criteria at the department level, and university policy.
- Evaluative Entities Beyond the Department - The FEC Report will serve as documentation that the faculty member has fulfilled all responsibilities required by departmental and university policies (Policies 6.1 and 6.28).

The FEC Report should be developed in consultation with the P&T mentorship team, and must include each of the components listed below, while addressing the evaluative criteria of teaching, scholarship, and service (Policy 6.1). Alternatively, an integrative approach could be utilized to address the three evaluative criteria. Policy states this narrative should be no longer than three pages and we have determined as a department that individual faculty can decide how much space to devote to each of the three evaluative criteria.

Reflective Prompts:
- What did you accomplish this year?
  - Do not use bullets. This is already in your Annual Report (Appendix X)
- How did your accomplishments compare to your plan? Why did it deviate?
- How did your accomplishments and challenges contribute to your long-term goals for engagement and development?
- How will your accomplishments and challenges shape your plan for next year?

Submission Order of Possible Required Appendices (DO NOT include additional narrative):
I. Checklist for key contributions (DO NOT USE BULLETS IN NARRATIVE)
II. Annual Report (the one submitted to the college in May, or a similar list if the college discontinues this)
III. FEC Plan from same academic year (for comparative purposes)
IV. Student evaluations (complete long report)
V. Peer observations
VI. Course syllabi (showing course objectives and learning outcomes, etc.)
VII. Others based on work of other FEC committee

<div align="center">

**Teaching Effectiveness Rubric**

</div>

Instructions for Use (suggested): This rubric is intended to serve as a summative assessment tool to evaluate a faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness. Each criteria has three components [Provided, Reflected, Resolved (if applicable)] in each of the three rating categories [Development Required, Acceptable, Exceeds Expectations]. A faculty member should meet all of the components [Provided, Reflected, Resolved (if applicable)] under the rating category [Development Required, Acceptable, Exceeds Expectations] as determined by the mentors to receive that rating for the criteria being assessed. The evaluator should then look at the ratings for each criteria before providing a final assesement of teaching effectiveness [Development Required or Acceptable]. Under each criteria title, there are examples of 'Potential Evidence' that could be used for the 'Provided' component and a set of suggested 'Reflective Prompts' for the 'Reflected' component. The applicability column indicates if the criteria must be addressed each year by the faculty member being evaluated.

| Criteria | Applicability | Rating Categories | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | **Development Required** | **Acceptable** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Formative Evaluations**<br><br>Potential Evidence: peer/mentor/chair evaluations, student evauations, etc.<br><br>Reflective Prompts: what were the identified issues in the formative evaluations, how did you attempt to address them, what were the results and discuss, etc. | Required | Provided: evidence of solicited feedback from formative evaluations as indicated by departmental policy.<br><br>Reflected: little to none on nor provided evidence of using solicited feedback from formative evaluations to inform teaching practices.<br><br>Resolved (if applicable): little to no evidence of having resolved any major issues in formative evaluations identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations. | Provided: evidence of solicited feedback from formative evaluations as indicated by departmental policy.<br><br>Reflected: on the evidence of feedback in formative evaluations and provided evidence of how teaching was informed by feedback.<br><br>Resolved (if applicable): any major issues in formative evaluations identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations. | Provided: evidence of solicited feedback from formative evaluations beyond required by departmental policy.<br><br>Reflected: on evidence from formative evaluations of identified issues, improvements made, and discussed the results.<br><br>Resolved (if applicable): has gone above and beyond to resolve any major issues identified from formative evaluations by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations. |
| **Use of Evidence-Based Teaching Practices (EBT Practices)**<br><br>Potential Evidence: peer/mentor/chair evaluations, student evaluations, semester schedule, description of in-class activities, etc.<br><br>Reflective Prompts: what were some areas you identified for incorporating EBT Practices, which EBT practices were attempted, evaluate the success of the EBT practices, etc. | Required | Provided: little to no evidence of the use of EBT Practices.<br><br>Reflected: little to none on the effectiveness of the EBT Practices that were used.<br><br>Resolved (if applicable): little to no evidence of having resolved any major issues in EBT Practices identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations. | Provided: evidence of the use of EBT Practices.<br><br>Reflected: on evidence of how the use of EBT Practices helped students achieve their learning outcomes.<br><br>Resolved (if applicable): any major issues in EBT Practices identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations. | Provided: evidence of the effective use of EBT Practices and that the teaching practices used helped increase student learning.<br><br>Reflected: on evidence of the effective use of EBT Practices and that the teaching practices used helped increase student learning.<br><br>Resolved (if applicable): has gone above and beyond to resolve any major issues in EBT Practices identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations. |

**Comments:**

| Criteria | Applicability | Rating Categories | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Development Required** | **Acceptable** | **Exceeds Expectations** |
| **Alignment of Objectives, Content, and Assessments within Courses**<br><br><br>Potential Evidence: peer/mentor/chair evaluations, course syllabi, etc.<br><br><br>Reflective Prompts: what areas were identified for alignment improvement, what was attempted for alignment and how successful were they, etc. | Required | Provided: evidence of course goals not articulated, or unclear, inappropriate or marginally related to curriculum. Content/materials are outdated or unsuitable for students in the course.<br><br>Reflected: little to none on alignment of objectives, content, and assessments. Did not report issue resolution when needed.<br><br>Resolved (if applicable): little to no evidence of having resolved any major issues in alignment identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations. | Provided: evidence that courses are well planned and organized, course goals are articulated, content is current and appropriate for topic/students/ curriculum/scope of this course, per Policy 6.36.<br><br>Reflected: on evidence of the alignment of objectives, content, and assessments.<br><br>Resolved (if applicable): any major issues in alignment identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations. | Provided: evidence that content is appropriately challenging, innovative, and/or related to current developments in field.<br><br>Reflected: on evidence that content is appropriately challenging, innovative, and/or related to current developments in field.<br><br>Resolved (if applicable): has gone above and beyond to resolve any major issues in alignment identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations. |
| **Positive Learning Environment**<br><br><br>Potential Evidence: peer/mentor/chair evaluations, student evaluation comments, etc.<br><br><br>Reflective Prompts: what areas were identified for learning environment improvement, what was attempted for improvement and how successful were they, etc. | Required | Provided: little to no evidence that learning environment is respectful or promotes a sense of belonging among students. Learning environment discourages learning or motivation.<br><br>Reflected: little to no evidence of a willingness to address legitimate student concerns about learning environment.<br><br>Resolved (if applicable): little to no evidence of having resolved any major issues in learning environment identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations. | Provided: evidence that learning environment is respectful and motivating; students have a sense of belonging and are working toward self-efficacy.<br><br>Reflected: on evidence of their learning environment; instructor seeks and is responsive to student feedback on learning environment.<br><br>Resolved (if applicable): any major issues in learning environment identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations. | Provided: evidence of intentionally creating/maintaining a positive and supportive learning environment that is inclusive, promotes respect, and encourages student motivation.<br><br>Reflected: on intentionally creating/ maintaining a positive and supportive learning environment that is inclusive, promotes respect, and encourages student motivation.<br><br>Resolved (if applicable): has gone above and beyond to resolve any major issues in learning environment identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations. |

**Comments:**

| Criteria | Applicability | Rating Categories | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Development Required | Acceptable | Exceeds Expectations |
| **Demonstrate Pedagogical Growth and/or Engagement**<br><br>Potential Evidence: a copy of the annual report or list of activities (e.g., colleague observations/discussions, reading literature, conference attendance, professional development), etc.<br><br>Reflective Prompts: describe instances of improvement, growth, or engagement in a pedagogical area and how it was incorporated into the classroom, etc. | Applicable this Year: Yes/No | Provided: little to no evidence of pedagogical growth and/or engagement.<br><br>Reflected: little to none on their pedagogical growth and/or engagement.<br><br><br>Resolved (if applicable): little to no evidence of having resolved any major issues in pedagogical growth and/or engagement identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations. | Provided: evidence of pedagogical growth and/or engagement.<br><br>Reflected: on the evidence of their pedagogical growth and/or engagement.<br><br><br>Resolved (if applicable): any major issues in pedagogical growth and/or engagement identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations. | Provided: evidence of multiple instances of pedagogical growth and/or engagment.<br><br>Reflected: on evidence of multiple instances of pedagogical growth and/or engagment they aimed to focus on improving/growing.<br><br>Resolved (if applicable): has gone above and beyond to resolve any major issues in pedagogical growth and/or engagement identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations. |
| **Teaching/Mentoring Students Outside the Classroom**<br><br>Potential Evidence: working with Teaching Assistants, student workers, interns, students applying to graduate/professional programs, list of student letters of recommendations, projects involving students, etc.<br><br>Reflective Prompts: describe your current or proposed activities involving teaching/ mentoring students outside the classroom, describe your attempts at incorporating students outside the classroom and how it facilitates student learning, etc. | Applicable this Year: Yes/No | Provided: little to no evidence of teaching/mentoring students outside the classroom.<br><br>Reflected: little to none on teaching/mentoring students outside the classroom.<br><br><br>Resolved (if applicable): little to no evidence of having resolved any major issues in teaching/mentoring students outside the classroom identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations. | Provided: evidence of teaching/mentoring students outside of the classroom.<br><br>Reflected: on evidence of how they teach/mentor students outside of the classroom.<br><br><br>Resolved (if applicable): any major issues in teaching/mentoring students outside the classroom identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations. | Provided: evidence of exceptional quality and time committment to teaching/mentoring students outside the classroom.<br><br>Reflected: on evidence of exceptional quality and time committment to teaching/mentoring students outside the classroom.<br><br>Resolved (if applicable): has gone above and beyond to resolve any major issues in teaching/mentoring students outside the classroom identified by mentors and/or chair in previous evaluations. |

**Comments:**

This Peer Observation of Teaching Instrument was created by the SUU Center of Excellence for Teaching and Learning, and was modified for use by the Department of Biology, as a resource to provide faculty with formative feedback on their teaching. The instrument is broken into 5 categories, each of which contains a number of evidence-based teaching practices that have been shown to improve student learning. To use this instrument, the observer simply records whether each practice is observed by placing a checkmark in the box next to the practice. The observer is not asked to assess how well each practice is used, only whether or not it is observed. Comments can also be provided about individual teaching practices, or whole categories, to give the instructor additional feedback.

It is important to note that an individual instructor should not be expected to use all of the teaching practices on this list. Certain practices may not be practical within the context of a course, or may not fit with an instructor's teaching style. This instrument was also not designed to assess the quality of instruction. Rather, it is meant to provide instructors with formative feedback about their use of evidence-based teaching practices, highlighting which practices are currently in use, and giving ideas about additional practices that could be incorporated into a course. Finally, this instrument was designed with traditional, face-to-face instruction in mind, and may not be appropriate for other delivery methods such as laboratory, studio, or online.

The CETL encourages peers and department chairs to use this instrument as is, or to modify it to better meet the needs of individual instructors or departments. Our hope is that this provides some structure to teaching observations, gives instructors valuable feedback on their teaching practices, and contributes to the larger conversation about teaching effectiveness across campus. If you have questions about how to use this instrument, or if you would like help modifying it, please don't hesitate to reach out to the CETL. Happy teaching!

# Biology Department Peer Observation of Teaching Instrument

**Name of Observer:** _____     **Date:** _____

**Name of Instructor:** _____     **Course Number:** _____

## Course Organization:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2"><h3>Objectives/goals</h3></td></tr>
<tr><td>Criteria</td><td>Comments</td></tr>
<tr><td>☐ Learning objectives or an outline for the session are provided at the beginning of class (verbally or visually).</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>☐ Content and activities are aligned with the stated learning objectives or session outline for the class period.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"><h3>Reinforcement of material</h3></td></tr>
<tr><td>Criteria</td><td>Comments</td></tr>
<tr><td>☐ Information is linked to previous class sessions and students' prior knowledge.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>☐ Topics are summarized periodically and/or at the end of class.</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

**Comments/Thoughtful Reflection:**

# Biology Department Peer Observation of Teaching Instrument

**Instructional Methods:**

## Teaching strategies

| Criteria | Comments |
|---|---|
| ☐ Varied pedagogical methods are used to engage diverse learners when/if appropriate. | |
| ☐ Examples are used to explain and demonstrate course concepts. | |
| ☐ The instructor periodically checks for student understanding and adjusts instruction accordingly. | |
| ☐ The instructor connects content to the real world experiences of the students. | |

## Teaching activities

| Criteria | Comments |
|---|---|
| ☐ Students are given opportunities to actively engage with the material. | |
| ☐ Students are asked to reflect on what they have learned. | |
| ☐ All students are encouraged to participate. | |

**Comments/Thoughtful Reflection:**

# Biology Department Peer Observation of Teaching Instrument

**Instructor-Student Interactions:**

| Building community | |
|---|---|
| Criteria | Comments |
| ☐ The instructor addresses students directly and respectfully. | |
| ☐ The instructor engages casually with students before and/or after class. | |
| ☐ The instructor effectively solicits questions from students and provides clear answers. | |
| **Course climate** | |
| Criteria | Comments |
| ☐ The instructor provides an inclusive, welcoming, and positive learning environment. | |
| ☐ The instructor and students demonstrate mutual respect. | |

**Comments/Thoughtful Reflection:**

# Biology Department Peer Observation of Teaching Instrument

**Presentation/Clarity**

| Style | |
|---|---|
| Criteria | Comments |
| ☐  The instructor speaks loudly and clearly. | |
| ☐  Voice tone and pitch are varied to provide emphasis, demonstrate enthusiasm, and maintain interest. | |
| ☐  The instructor avoids reading excessively from notes or slides. | |
| ☐  Eye contact is maintained with the students. | |

| Clarity | |
|---|---|
| Criteria | Comments |
| ☐  Information is presented in a way that is clear and easy to understand. | |
| ☐  Visual aids and whiteboard use are effective and clear. | |
| ☐  The pacing is appropriate for students to follow along and take notes. | |

**Comments/Thoughtful Reflection:**

# Biology Department Peer Observation of Teaching Instrument

**Content:**

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2"><strong>Alignment</strong></td></tr>
<tr><td>Criteria</td><td>Comments</td></tr>
<tr><td>☐ Class content and expectations are set at an appropriate level.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>☐ The material presented is relevant to the course.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2"><strong>Expertise</strong></td></tr>
<tr><td>Criteria</td><td>Comments</td></tr>
<tr><td>☐ The instructor demonstrates a deep understanding of the subject.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>☐ The material presented is current and accurate.</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

**Comments/Thoughtful Reflection:**

Observer Signature:_____

Instructor Signature:_____

# Tenure Track / Tenured Professor Teaching Effectiveness Policy

Consistent with SUU's mission as defined in R312, teaching is of primary importance. FEC Plans and Reports should emphasize contributions that are teaching and student-focused. Evaluation practices will also focus on faculty teaching efficacy. These will be assessed through the use of student, peer, department chair (except the department chair may not evaluate his/her own teaching effectiveness), self- evaluations, and other pertinent information as described in departmental teaching effectiveness rubric.

Tenure Track Faculty are expected to work with their Mentorship team to critically evaluate their teaching effectiveness and plan for professional growth as an educator. In cases where improvement is needed, teaching effectiveness can be developed through a wide array of evidence-based pedagogical practices and pedagogical development activities.

## Basic Responsibilities for TT Assistant Professor
1. Adherence to University Policy 6.28 (Faculty Professional Responsibility).
2. Perform and report student evaluations of all courses with the exception of BIOL 4830, 4840, 4850, 4890.
3. Receive 1 Chair or Mentor classroom observation per year.
4. Receive 1 additional peer observation per year (cannot be the same as Chair/Mentor)
5. Perform 1 peer observation per year.
6. Perform self-reflection of teaching effectiveness yearly.

## Basic Responsibilities for Tenured Associate Professor
1. Adherence to University Policy 6.28 (Faculty Professional Responsibility) .
2. Perform and report student evaluations of all courses with the exception of BIOL 4830, 4840, 4850, 4890 .
3. Receive at least 1 peer observation for each year with a teaching load (to be included in 5-Year Report).
4. Perform at least 1 peer observation for each year with a teaching load.
5. Faculty must create a 5-year Plan, beginning their first year as a Tenured Associate. This plan should demonstrate how they intend to meet the responsibilities of a Tenured Associate and, if applicable, how they will meet the requirements for rank advancement.
6. Faculty must create a 5-year Report, beginning at the start of their sixth year as a Tenured Associate. This report should demonstrate Acceptable teaching performance for each year, and well as yearly review and reflection.

## Basic Responsibilities for Tenured Full Professor
1. Adherence to University Policy 6.28 (Faculty Professional Responsibility) .
2. Perform and report student evaluations of all courses with the exception of BIOL 4830, 4840, 4850, 4890 .
3. Receive at least 1 peer observation for each year with a teaching load (to be included in 5-Year Report).
4. Perform at least 1 peer observation for each year with a teaching load.
5. Faculty must create a 5-year Plan, beginning their first year as a Full Professor. This plan should demonstrate how they intend to meet the responsibilities of a Full Professor.

6. Faculty must create a 5-year Report, beginning at the start of their sixth year as a Tenured Full Professor. This report should demonstrate Acceptable teaching performance for each year, and well as yearly review and reflection.

## Evaluation Criteria
**Tenure Track faculty are evaluated on a yearly basis. Tenured faculty are evaluated every 5 years or when applying for rank advancement.**

**Acceptable:**
1. The faculty member demonstrates acceptable performance in teaching effectiveness based information as described in departmental teaching effectiveness rubric.
2. The faculty member has also demonstrated thoughtful reflection of their evaluations and integrated any changes necessary based on evaluation feedback and reflection.

**Development required:**
1. The faculty member demonstrates unacceptable performance falling short of standard, acceptable performance, and/or demonstrates recurring weakness(es) in some area(s).
2. Extenuating circumstances such as, but not limited to, medical leave, may cause a faculty member's teaching performance to fall below acceptable levels. In these circumstances, when proper documentation is provided, the faculty member may receive an **Acceptable with consideration** evaluation for that year.
3. When a faculty member receives a **Development Required** evaluation, it is expected that they will work with their mentors in developing their yearly plan to improve performance in the specific areas of weakness over the following academic year.
4. If a faculty member receives a **Development Required** evaluation two years in a row, a developmental plan will be implemented by the Department Chair for improvement of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness. The faculty member will remain on that developmental plan until its goals/objectives are met and they receive an **Acceptable** evaluation for Teaching Effectiveness.
5. If both the faculty member's mentors and chair feel that teaching performance is significantly lacking, the faculty member may be placed on a developmental plan after only one **Development Required** evaluation.

## Standards for Tenure/Promotion of from TT Assistant to Associate Professor

1. Appropriate time employed for application of tenure and/or promotion according to Policy 6.1.
2. If placed on a developmental plan, faculty must have completed/fulfilled the plan by achieving its goals.
3. The faculty member must have been rated **Acceptable** for Teaching Effectiveness a minimum of four (4) years.

## Standards for Promotion from Tenured Associate to Full Professor*

1. Appropriate time employed for application of tenure and/or promotion according to Policy 6.1.
2. Applications for rank advancement from Associate to Full Professor must cover a minimum of 5 to a maximum of 8 years of the most recent activity as an Associate Professor.
3. Must have taught an average of at least a half time teaching load through SUU over the period being evaluated for rank advancement. Faculty who were at the level of Associate Professor prior to this policy's adoption are exempt from this requirement.
4. Of the required peer observations, at least one (1) must be from the department Chair and at least two (2) must be from tenured faculty within the department.
5. If placed on a developmental plan, faculty must have completed/fulfilled the plan by achieving its goals.
6. Faculty must demonstrate continued development of teaching excellence through at least four (4) activities, outcomes, or achievements that demonstrate teaching development, impact, or leadership beyond the requirements for achieving the Associate Professor rank.
   Examples of activities, outcomes, or achievements that faculty can document:
   1. Mentoring of faculty or students.
   2. Collaboration with other faculty outside of the department or university.
   3. Contributions to the field in curriculum or program development beyond what is normally expected of a faculty member.
   4. Establishing partnerships with outside agencies to foster student engagement.
   5. Reflecting and responding to review/evaluation using teaching inventories.
   6. Incorporation of high impact teaching practices.
   7. Receiving teaching recognition awards (e.g. Thunderbird Award)
   8. Attending pedagogical conferences/workshops and providing evidence of adapting teaching practices.
   9. Teaching activities performed as part of a special appointment by the university.
   10. A teaching activity, pre-approved as a key contribution, in writing, by both the Dean of the College and the Chair of the Biology Department.


*\* Faculty who intend to apply for rank advancement are strongly encouraged to have their application materials reviewed by both the Chair and other departmental faculty, prior to submission.*

## Tenure Track / Tenured Professor Scholarly Activity Policy

Faculty are selected, retained, and promoted primarily on the basis of evidence of effective teaching. Departmental standards of performance in scholarship for tenure track faculty are based on the concept of the Teacher-Scholar, and the belief that faculty scholarship is beneficial to undergraduate education, the educational mission of the department, and development of the faculty member.

These standards emphasize the value of research, publication, and grant writing for establishing currency/expertise in their field and the use of this expertise in educating and engaging undergraduate students in scholarly activity. The department also recognizes the value of scholarly activity in creating communities of engagement, establishing collegial relationships though the department, college, university, and beyond.

## Basic Responsibilities for Tenure Track and Tenured Professors

1. Define research interest(s) and/or describe plan for scholarly activity and development in yearly Plan or 5-year Plan.
2. Demonstrate evidence of scholarly activity by the second year of employment and continue to engage in scholarly activity throughout employment at SUU.
3. Demonstrate regular engagement with students that involves extracurricular scholarly activity.

## Key Contributions required for Tenure/Rank Advancement to Associate Professor

1. One (1) publication that fits one or more of the Boyer Model categories.
   a. Must include a formal, external review.
   b. Must be disseminated to at least a regional or national audience.
   c. Must contribute to the scientific or pedagogical field.
   d. Cannot be through a predatory journal.
   e. Must be in print at the time of application. If *accepted* and *in press* or *forthcoming*, faculty must provide written documentation from the Department Chair and Dean that the publication will be acceptable within the application's time frame.
   f. If first author, the majority of the work and/or writing must have been completed while employed at SUU.
   g. If not the first author, faculty must demonstrate essential contribution to the work while employed at SUU.
2. One external grant submission.
   a. Must be documented though SPARC office, or mentorship team, or chair.
3. Must demonstrate engaging with students in scholarly activity.
   a. At least 2 documented instances of mentoring students in extracurricular scholarly activity
      i. The instance must be disseminated to an extracurricular audience.
      ii. This may include research/data collection, scholarly writing work, formal presentations or publications of research.

## Key Contributions required for rank advancement from Associate to Full Professor

Contributions in Scholarly activity should demonstrate a continued development of their scholarly activity through the quality, quantity, or impact of work.

1. Associate Professors applying for Full Professor must meet the same Scholarly Activity Key Contributions as required for Associate Professor rank, but within the 5-8 year review period.
2. In addition, faculty must complete at least one (1) of the following:
   a) One (1) additional publication that fits one or more of the Boyer Model categories.
   b) One (1) additional external grant submission.
   c) A conference presentation made at a minimum of a regional (multi-state) level.
   d) A significant governmental report/map.
   e) External publication of a textbook.
   f) Two (2) supervised student research projects leading to appropriate student presentations at a minimum of a state level or broader.
   g) Scholarly activities performed as part of a special appointment by the university.
   h) A scholarly activity, pre-approved as a key contribution, in writing, by both the Dean of the College and the Chair of the Biology Department.

## Evaluation Criteria
**Tenure Track Faculty are evaluated on a yearly basis. Tenured Faculty are evaluated every 5 years or when applying for rank advancement.**

**Acceptable:**
1. The faculty member demonstrates acceptable performance based on their fulfillment of the basic responsibilities of scholarly activity and acceptable progress towards the key contributions as outlined by the department.
2. The faculty member has also demonstrated thoughtful reflection of their scholarly activity and its impact on students, the department, the university, and their own professional development.

**Development required:**
1. The faculty member demonstrates unacceptable performance, falling short of the basic responsibilities, and/or not demonstrating acceptable progress towards the key contributions for scholarly activity.
2. Extenuating circumstances such as, but not limited to, medical leave, may cause a faculty member's scholarly performance to fall below acceptable levels. In these circumstances, when proper documentation is provided, the faculty member may receive an **Acceptable with consideration** evaluation for that year.
3. When a faculty member receives a **Development Required** evaluation, it is expected that they will work with their mentors in developing their yearly plan to improve performance in the specific areas of weakness.
4. If a faculty member receives a **Development Required** evaluation two years in a row, a developmental plan will be implemented by the Department Chair for improvement of the faculty member's scholarly activity. The faculty member will remain on that developmental

plan until its goals/objectives are met and they receive an **Acceptable** evaluation for Scholarly Activity.

5. If both the faculty member's mentors and chair feel that scholarly activity performance is significantly lacking, the faculty member may be placed on a developmental plan after only one **Development Required** evaluation.

## Standards for Tenure/Promotion

1. Appropriate time employed for application of tenure and/or promotion according to Policy 6.1.
2. Applications for rank advancement from Associate to Full Professor must cover a minimum of 5 to a maximum of 8 years of the most recent activity as an Associate Professor.
3. If placed on a developmental plan, faculty must have completed/fulfilled the plan by achieving its goals.
4. Completion of Key Contributions for Scholarly Activity as defined by the department.

# Tenure Track / Tenured Professor Service Policy

        The Biology Department defines service as activities that contribute to the Department, College, University, Profession, or Community in ways that fulfill and support SUU's Mission, Vision, and/or Core Value statements. Although service is a key component to a faculty member's profession and the functioning of the Department and University, standards of performance in service contributions are limited to ensure that faculty members maintain a proper balance in workload that is appropriate for their rank.

        The Biology FEC system was designed to provide flexibility in the contributions faculty engage in, providing the ability to both play to one's strengths and to encourage growth through continual professional development. To ensure this flexibility, there is no specific requirement for the types of service activities that must be performed. Rather, emphasis is placed on the effort expended and on the impact of a faculty member's service.

        Service activities may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Serving on or chairing committees at departmental, college, or university level.
- Community engagement related to one's area of professional expertise and/or as a representative of the University.
- Service to a professional organization relevant to the faculty member's field of study or specialization.
- Service directly interacting with students.
- Integrating service with scholarship and/or teaching.
- Mentorship and or collaboration with faculty.

        Tenure Track Faculty are expected to work with their mentorship team to develop a plan for service that incorporates increasing levels of performance and impact appropriate with faculty member's rank.


## Basic Responsibilities for Tenure Track and Tenured Professors

1. Define service interest(s) and/or describe plan for fulfilling service to department, college, university, profession, and/or community in FEC Plan and Report as approved by their mentorship team and/or chair.
2. Demonstrate, through service, engagement with the University and/or broader community.
3. Per Policy 6.1, the mentorship team and/or chair are responsible for monitoring the service workload of their faculty to ensure that an inordinate amount of department/college/school/university/ad hoc committee work has not been assigned, particularly in the first year of employment.


## Key Contributions required for tenure/rank advancement to Associate Professor

By the time of tenure application, the faculty member must have demonstrated service in an average of 3 activities per year. Certain service activities may require a significantly higher workload than others. Faculty should work with their mentors to determine how various service activities contribute to the required service load.

## Key Contributions required for rank advancement from Associate to Full Professor

Faculty must develop their service contributions beyond basic activities/responsibilities. This can be demonstrated through at least one (1) of the following examples:

1. Assuming leadership roles such as chairing committees, programs, or activities.
2. Serving on committees or through activities that have a broader impact, beyond the department.
3. Service as a faculty member on committees or with organizations outside of SUU.
4. Service performed as part of a special appointment by the university.
5. A service activity, pre-approved as a key contribution, in writing, by both the Dean of the College and the Chair of the Biology Department.

## Evaluation Criteria

**Tenure Track faculty are evaluated on a yearly basis. Tenured faculty are evaluated every 5 years or when applying for rank advancement.**

**Acceptable:**
1. The faculty member demonstrates acceptable performance based on their fulfillment of the basic responsibilities and for service and acceptable progress towards the key contributions as outlined by the department and as approved by their mentorship team and departmental chair.
2. The faculty member has also demonstrated thoughtful reflection of their service contributions and their impact on students, the department, the university, and their own professional development.

**Development required:**
1. The faculty member demonstrates unacceptable performance, falling short of the basic responsibilities, and/or not demonstrating acceptable progress towards the key contributions for scholarly activity.
2. Extenuating circumstances such as, but not limited to, medical leave, may cause a faculty member's service contributions to fall below acceptable levels. In these circumstances, when proper documentation is provided, the faculty member may receive an **Acceptable with consideration** evaluation for that year.
3. When a faculty member receives a **Development Required** evaluation, it is expected that they will work with their mentors in developing their yearly plan to improve performance in the specific areas of weakness.
4. If a faculty member receives a **Development Required** evaluation two years in a row, a developmental plan will be implemented by the Department Chair for improvement of the faculty member's service contributions. The faculty member will remain on that developmental plan until its goals/objectives are met and they receive an **Acceptable** evaluation for Service Contributions.
5. If both the faculty member's mentors and chair feel that service contributions are significantly lacking, the faculty member may be placed on a developmental plan after only one **Development Required** evaluation.

## Standards for Tenure/Promotion of Tenure-Track Faculty

1. Appropriate time employed for application of tenure and/or promotion according to Policy 6.1.
2. Applications for rank advancement from Associate to Full Professor must cover a minimum of 5 to a maximum of 8 years of the most recent activity as an Associate Professor
3. If placed on a developmental plan, faculty must have completed/fulfilled the plan by achieving its goals.
4. Completion of Key Contributions for Service as defined by the department.
5. The faculty member must have been rated **Acceptable** for Service Contributions a minimum of four (4) years.

## Non-Tenure Track Teaching Effectiveness Policy:

Consistent with SUU's mission as defined in R312, teaching is of primary importance. FEC Plans and Reports should emphasize contributions that are teaching and student-focused. Evaluation practices will also focus on faculty teaching efficacy. These can/will be assessed through the use of student, peer, department chair, (except the department chair may not evaluate his/her own teaching effectiveness), and self- evaluations, or other pertinent information. Student evaluations will also be conducted in all classes taught every semester. The responses to all teaching-related questions on the student-evaluation instrument will be considered in assessing teaching ability.

Faculty are expected to work with their Mentorship team to critically evaluate their teaching effectiveness and plan for professional growth as an educator. In cases where improvement is needed, Teaching effectiveness can be developed through a wide array of evidence-based pedagogical practices and pedagogical development activities.

## Basic Responsibilities for NTT Lecturer
- Adherence to University Policy 6.28 (Faculty Professional Responsibility)
- Perform and report student evaluations of all courses with the exception of BIOL 4830, 4840, 4850, 4890
- Include 2 classroom observations per year. These observations must be from 2 of these categories of individuals: Chair, Mentor, and/or Faculty member who has achieved rank advancement at SUU.
- Include 1 additional peer observation per year.
  - Cannot be the same as Chair, Mentor, or Faculty member used above.
- Perform 1 peer observation per year.
- Perform self-reflection of teaching effectiveness yearly.


## Basic Responsibilities for NTT Assistant Professor
- Adherence to University Policy 6.28 (Faculty Professional Responsibility)
- Perform and report student evaluations of all courses with the exception of BIOL 4830, 4840, 4850, 4890
- Include 1 Chair or Mentor classroom observation per year.
- Include 1 additional peer observation per year.
  - Cannot be the same as Chair/Mentor
- Perform 1 peer observation per year.
- Perform self-reflection of teaching effectiveness yearly.



## Yearly Evaluation Criteria

**Acceptable:**
- The faculty member demonstrates acceptable performance in teaching effectiveness based on their Student, Peer, Chair, Self-Evaluations, Teaching Inventories, etc.
- The faculty member has also demonstrated thoughtful reflection of their evaluations and integrated any changes necessary based on evaluation feedback and reflection.

**Development required:**
- The faculty member demonstrates unacceptable performance falling short of standard, acceptable performance, and/or demonstrates recurring weakness(es) in some area(s).
- Extenuating circumstances such as, but not limited to, medical leave, may cause a faculty member's teaching performance to fall below acceptable levels. In these circumstances, when proper documentation is provided, the faculty member may receive an **Acceptable with consideration** evaluation for that year.
- When a faculty member receives a **Development Required** evaluation, it is expected that they will work with their mentors in developing their yearly plan to improve performance in the specific areas of weakness over the following academic year.
- If a faculty member receives a **Development Required** evaluation two years in a row, a developmental plan will be implemented by the Department Chair for improvement of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness. The faculty member will remain on that developmental plan until its goals/objectives are met and they receive an **Acceptable** evaluation for Teaching Effectiveness.
- If both the faculty member's mentors and chair feel that teaching performance is significantly lacking, the faculty member may be placed on a developmental plan after only one **Development Required** evaluation.

## Standards for Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty from Lecturer to Assistant Professor

- Appropriate time employed for application of promotion according to Policy 6.1.
- If placed on a developmental plan, faculty must have completed/fulfilled the plan by achieving its goals.
- The faculty member must have been rated **Acceptable** for Teaching Effectiveness a minimum of 60% of years employed at the current rank.

## Standards for Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty from Assistant to Associate Professor

- Appropriate time employed for application of promotion according to Policy 6.1.
- If placed on a developmental plan, faculty must have completed/fulfilled the plan by achieving its goals.
- The faculty member must have been rated **Acceptable** for Teaching Effectiveness a minimum of 65% of years employed at the current rank.

## Non-Tenure Track Scholarly Activity Policy

Faculty are selected, retained, and promoted primarily on the basis of evidence of effective teaching. Departmental standards of performance in scholarship for non-tenure track faculty are based on the concept of the Teacher-Scholar, and the belief that faculty scholarship is beneficial to undergraduate education, the educational mission of the department, and development of the faculty member.

These standards emphasize the value of research, publication, and grant writing for establishing currency/expertise in their field and the use of this expertise in educating and engaging undergraduate students in scholarly activity. The department also recognizes the value of scholarly activity in creating communities of engagement, establishing collegial relationships though the department, college, university, and beyond.

## Basic Responsibilities

1. Describe plan for scholarly activity and development in yearly plan or 5-year plan and demonstrate evidence of scholarly activity beginning the second year of employment.
2. Faculty are expected to work with their Mentorship Team and/or Chair to develop a plan for Scholarly Activity that is appropriate with the faculty member's rank.

## Key Contributions required for rank advancement from Lecturer to NTT Assistant Professor

1. One documentable scholarly activity/product that fits one or more of the Boyer Model categories.
- OR -
2. At least 1 documented instance of engaging students in extracurricular scholarly activity.
    1. The instance must be disseminated to an extracurricular audience.
    2. This may include research/data collection, scholarly writing work, formal presentations or publications of research.
    3. This may include the assistance in another existing research project being undertaken by students being mentored by another faculty member or organization in a relevant scientific or pedagogical field.

## Key Contributions required for rank advancement from NTT Assistant to NTT Associate

1. Demonstrate a level of scholarly engagement beyond the requirements of NTT Assistant Professor.
    a. This scholarly activity/product should fit one or more of the Boyer Model categories.
2. Demonstrate student engagement beyond the requirements of NTT Assistant Professor.
    a. The instance must be disseminated to an extracurricular audience.
    b. This may include research/data collection, scholarly writing work, formal presentations or publications of research.
    c. This may include the assistance in another existing research project being undertaken by students being mentored by another faculty member or organization in a relevant scientific or pedagogical field.

<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>
**Non-Tenure Track Faculty at the rank of Lecturer or Assistant Professor, are evaluated on a yearly basis. Non-Tenure Track Faculty at the rank of Associate Professor are evaluated every 5 years.**

**Acceptable:**
1. The faculty member demonstrates acceptable performance based on their fulfillment of the basic responsibilities of scholarly activity and acceptable progress towards the key contributions as outlined by the department.
2. The faculty member has also demonstrated thoughtful reflection of their scholarly activity and its impact on students, the department, the university, and their own professional development.

**Development required:**
1. The faculty member demonstrates unacceptable performance, falling short of the basic responsibilities, and/or not demonstrating acceptable progress towards the key contributions for scholarly activity.
2. Extenuating circumstances such as, but not limited to, medical leave, may cause a faculty member's scholarly performance to fall below acceptable levels. In these circumstances, when proper documentation is provided, the faculty member may receive an **Acceptable with consideration** evaluation for that year.
3. When a faculty member receives a **Development Required** evaluation, it is expected that they will work with their mentors in developing their yearly plan to improve performance in the specific areas of weakness.
4. If a faculty member receives a **Development Required** evaluation two years in a row, a developmental plan will be implemented by the Department Chair for improvement of the faculty member's scholarly activity. The faculty member will remain on that developmental plan until its goals/objectives are met and they receive an **Acceptable** evaluation for Scholarly Activity.
5. If both the faculty member's mentors and chair feel that scholarly activity performance is significantly lacking, the faculty member may be placed on a developmental plan after only one **Development Required** evaluation.

<u>Standards for Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty</u>
1. Appropriate time employed for application of promotion according to Policy 6.1.
2. Applications for rank advancement from Lecturer to NTT Assistant Professor must cover a minimum of 4 to a maximum of 6 years of the most recent activity as a Lecturer.
3. Applications for rank advancement from NTT Assistant to NTT Associate Professor must cover a minimum of 6 to a maximum of 9 years of the most recent activity as an Assistant Professor.
4. If placed on a developmental plan, faculty must have completed/fulfilled the plan by achieving its goals.
5. Completion of Key Contributions for Scholarly Activity as defined by the department.

<u>**Non-Tenure Track Service Policy**</u>

   The Biology Department defines service as activities that contribute to the Department, College, University, Profession, or Community in ways that fulfill and supports SUU's Mission, Vision, and/or Core Value statements. Though service is a key component to a faculty member's profession and the functioning of the Department and University, standards of performance in service contributions are limited to ensure that faculty members maintain a proper balance in workload that is appropriate for their rank.

   The Biology FEC system was designed to provide flexibility in the contributions faculty engage in, providing the ability to both play to one's strengths and to encourage growth through continual professional development. To ensure this flexibility, there is no specific requirement for the types of service activities that must be performed. Rather, emphasis is placed on the effort put forth and the impact of a faculty member's service.

   Service activities may include, but are not limited to the following:
- Serving on or chairing committees at departmental, college, or university level.
- Community engagement related to one's area of professional expertise and/or as a representative of the University.
- Service to professional organization relevant to field of study or specialization.
- Service directly interacting with students.
- Integrating service with scholarship and/or teaching.
- Mentorship and/or collaboration with faculty.

   Non-Tenure Track Faculty are expected to work with their mentorship team and/or Chair to develop a plan for service that incorporates increasing levels of performance and impact appropriate with faculty member's rank.

<u>**Basic Responsibilities**</u>
1. Define service interest(s) and/or describe plan for fulfilling service to department, college, university, profession, and/or community in FEC Plan and Report as approved by their mentorship team and/or Chair.
2. Demonstrate, through service, engagement with the University and/or broader community.
3. Per Policy 6.1, the mentorship team and/or chair are responsible for monitoring the service workload of their faculty to ensure that an inordinate amount of department/college/school/university/ad hoc committee work has not been assigned, particularly in the first year of employment.

<u>**Key Contributions required for rank advancement from Lecturer to NTT Assistant Professor**</u>
By the time of application, the faculty member must have demonstrated service and engagement, beyond basic responsibilities, as determined/approved by their mentorship team and department chair.

<u>**Key Contributions required for rank advancement from Assistant to NTT Associate Professor**</u>
By the time of tenure application, the faculty member must have participated in a minimum of six (6) service activities, beyond basic responsibilities, as determined/approved by their mentorship team and department chair.

<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>
**Non-Tenure Track Faculty at the rank of Lecturer or Assistant Professor, are evaluated on a yearly basis. Non-Tenure Track Faculty at the rank of Associate Professor are evaluated every 5 years**

**Acceptable:**
1. The faculty member demonstrates acceptable performance based on their fulfillment of the basic responsibilities for service and acceptable progress towards the key contributions as outlined by the department.
2. The faculty member has also demonstrated thoughtful reflection of their service contributions and their impact on students, the department, the university, and their own professional development.

**Development required:**
1. The faculty member demonstrates unacceptable performance, falling short of the basic responsibilities, and/or not demonstrating acceptable progress towards the key contributions for scholarly activity.
2. Extenuating circumstances such as, but not limited to, medical leave, may cause a faculty member's service contributions to fall below acceptable levels. In these circumstances, when proper documentation is provided, the faculty member may receive an **Acceptable with consideration** evaluation for that year.
3. When a faculty member receives a **Development Required** evaluation, it is expected that they will work with their mentors in developing their yearly plan to improve performance in the specific areas of weakness.
4. If a faculty member receives a **Development Required** evaluation two years in a row, a developmental plan will be implemented by the Department Chair for improvement of the faculty member's service contributions. The faculty member will remain on that developmental plan until its goals/objectives are met and they receive an **Acceptable** evaluation for Service Contributions.
5. If both the faculty member's mentors and chair feel that service contributions are significantly lacking, the faculty member may be placed on a developmental plan after only one **Development Required** evaluation.

<u>**Standards for Promotion of Non-Tenure Track Faculty**</u>
1. Appropriate time employed for application of tenure and/or promotion according to Policy 6.1.
2. Applications for rank advancement from Lecturer to NTT Assistant Professor must cover a minimum of 4 to a maximum of 6 years of the most recent activity as a Lecturer.
3. Applications for rank advancement from NTT Assistant to NTT Associate Professor must cover a minimum of 6 to a maximum of 9 years of the most recent activity as an Associate Professor.
4. If placed on a developmental plan, faculty must have completed/fulfilled the plan by achieving its goals.
5. Completion of Key Contributions for Service as defined by the department.